



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

564-71, ι 54-55, but not so easy in the case of others, such as θ 86-92, 442-48, κ 251, 287-88, λ 179. On the other hand, he retains ι 489, κ 475-79, μ 374-90, 445-46, whereas Ludwich brackets them.

While he agrees in the main with Ludwich as regards the readings adopted in his text, the following differences show that Sitzler is independent in his judgment. Like Kaegi in Vol. I, he reads ἦτος, ὀνήματα, χρῶν, χρῆτος, χρῶ, τραπήομεν, ἦατο, ἀρνηούς, δαίω, θήω, θήη, thus with Brugmann and other comparative philologists giving the preference to η over ει in these words. He adopts also the forms ἴσσασι (where its first syllable is metrically long), μετενίσετο, νισόμεθα, πέπασθε, and ἔησι in θ 147, 580, which are well supported. Two attractive emendations are made by Sitzler in θ 559: ἀλλ' αὐτῆσιν νηυσὶ νοήματα καὶ φρένες ἀνδρῶν, and ι 266 f.: ἱκανόμενοι τὰ σὰ γούνα λισσόμεθ'; but his conjectures παραὶ η 125 and ἰδρεύνουσι 131 seem unnecessary. In the last passage, ἰδρεύνοντο comes at the close of a late interpolation (103-31), and so was probably borrowed from ρ 206 (cf. h. Hom. Cer. 99). The following conjectures of other scholars and variant readings, which are adopted by Sitzler but not by Ludwich, the reviewer is ready to accept: η 74 ἦσί τ' ἐπιφροσύνησι, 89 ἀργύρεοι σταθμοὶ δ' ἐν, 250 ἐλάσας, 283 ἐκ δὲ πεσὼν θυμηγέρεον, θ 307 ἔργ' ἀγέλαστα, ι 239, 338 ἔντοθεν, 388 ἰόντα, 459 ραίνουτο, κ 30 ἔόντες, 130 ἄλα, λ 390 ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι, 498 εἰ γὰρ, 513 ἐν πεδίῳ Τρώων, μ 181 ἀπῆμεν ὅσον τε, 370 μέγ'. But Sitzler seems to be at fault in adopting Kirchhoff's ῥίψασκε for ῥίπτασκε of the MSS in θ 374, λ 592 (cf. O 23, Ψ 827, τ 575). With ῥίπτασκε (v. ῥιπτάζω, cf. κρύπτασκε (v. κρυπτάζω) © 272, ισάσκετο (v. ισάζω) Ω 607. εἰῶ θ 571 is rather attractive, but is not absolutely necessary; nor is Bekker's ἡρώων Δαναῶν θ 578 convincing. In λ 371 where Sitzler reads οἱ τέ τοι αὐτῶ, there is no need of correction, since οἱ τοι ἄμ' αὐτῶ . . . ἄμ' ἔποντο is merely a combination of two familiar constructions, e.g., ο 541 and α 331. For the doubling of the preposition here, cf. ζ 77, υ 260. The MS reading οὐ γὰρ πῶς τι in μ 208 is better than the conjecture of La Roche, οὐ γὰρ πῶς τι, adopted by Sitzler. οὔπω in the sense of "not at all," "in no way" occurs also in Γ 306 (cf. Leaf), Δ 184 (cf. Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang*), 234, M 270, etc.

CHARLES W. PEPLER

EMORY COLLEGE

Les Pensées de Marc-Aurèle. Traduction par A.-P. LEMERCIER.
Paris: Félix Alcan, 1910. Fr. 3.50.

This readable version, which bears none of the marks of a translation in its smooth and fluent style, is based on the Teubner text of Stich, the variations from which are justified in a critical Appendix. A brief Introduction, full of good sense, protests against Renan's exaggeration of what he calls "l'ennui de Marc-Aurèle," and defends the philosophic emperor against the charge of having persecuted the church with special cruelty: "On veut

voir une tache de sang sur le livre des *Pensées*, et elle n'y est pas." The translation is in the main correct, though its freedom and the failure to employ one word consistently to represent each of the principal Stoic technical terms make it unsafe for the student of philosophy to base conclusions on its precise phrasing. I note a few slight inaccuracies, as they appear to me. In i. 7 *προτρεπτικά λογάρια* are not quite "petits discours captieux," unless "captieux" is to be understood in a peculiar sense. In i. 16 the emendation *ἐπιτηδευσις* for *ἐπιτηδεύων* on the ground that *ἐπιτηδεύων* "n'a pas de sens ici" is a mistake, and the translation "comme un homme qui agit par amitié" is impossible. *Ἐπιτηδεύων* in the context clearly means "affecting" or "priding himself upon." In ii. 1 "insupportables" is not quite adequate for *ἀκοινωνήτῃ*. In ii. 5 *ἀπηλλαγμένην πάσης εἰκασιέτητος* is not "sans aucune réflexion." In iii. 4 *in fine* the words *οἷγε οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκονται* are omitted because "les gens que méprise Marc-Aurèle, sont loin de mépriser eux-mêmes." This is to forget that Seneca's "omnis stultitia fastidio laborat sui" is good Stoic doctrine, and that the idea that only the wise and good man can be dear to himself is found in the last sentence of Plato's *Republic*. In iv. 38 the rendering "Que ton regard pénètre jusqu'à l'âme des sages, et tu sauras ce qu'ils fuient, ce qu'ils recherchent" misses the contemptuous meaning, which is in effect: "Look into their souls, even the wisest of them (*καὶ τοὺς φρονίμους*), what things they shun and what pursue." In iv. 44 "banal" fails to give the feeling of *γνώριμον*, which is "familiar" or "friendly" in the Emersonian-Stoic sense.

But to multiply these trifles would give an unfair impression of an excellent piece of work.

PAUL SHOREY

A History of Classical Philology from the Seventh Century B.C. to the Twentieth Century A.D. By HARRY THURSTON PECK, PH.D., LL.D. New York: Macmillan, 1911. \$2.

Professor Peck disclaims all intention of emulating Sandys or superseding Gudeman. He is not offering a work of reference for scholars or a repetitorium in preparation for the Doctor's examination. He is trying to put into brief compass and readable form the information with regard to the history and significance of his subject which an intelligent student of the classics in his senior year or in the first year of graduate study ought to, but rarely does, possess. He is right in saying that hitherto no such work has been available, and he is justified in his hope "that the book may be of some practical service to students of the classics." Any competent teacher could give his classes most of the facts which Dr. Peck has collected, and doubtless there are several men in the country whose manuscript lectures cover substantially the same ground. But they have not published and Professor Peck has,